Dear Dave,

7/31/91

Although for a long time it has not been possible for me to find uninterrupted time so I could concentrate I don't remember as many interruptions as of recent weeks, beginning with the extra trips to doctors over the new trouble with my right or better leg and the diagnosis of spinal sinosis. Coinciding with that or preceeding it three weekly blood tests were ordered, the results of each requiring endless calls to the family doctor's office for instruction on medication. His phones can be busy for an hour at a time. I've even driven there four times this year that I can recall after not getting through by phone and at least two of those times additional blood tests were ordered. Having just seen him last Thursday I had to see the podiatrist Monday, for the third time in less than two weeks. He then found what he had apparently not been able to detect before, a large piece of nail ingrown on the left big toe. It had become infected. He removed a piece of nail amost a half inch in largest dimension. Driving home from his office and thinking about this it amused me that I do not and I'm sure won't feel like Job.

I even sprained a foot, the first sprain I remember ever having. The pain is no big deal but it does slow me down and requires that I be more careful. And treat it.

When Bil perceived the good results of my physical therapy she went to the same orthopaedist and got the same diagnosis, of spinal sinosis. That took extra time for going elsewhere for X-rays, his radiologist having just left, and now extra trips for her physical therapy. She sustained a setback Monday because of the all walking at the hospital where her younger sister had successful outpatient surgery. As she drives me to Baltimore to Johns Hopkins I drive her to some of her local medical consultations, sometimes so Bil can be with her, and each entails at least several hours.

Monday, between the TV show Inside Edition and a small radio station in Grand Rapids I was on the phone at least three hours, maybe more. I declined appearing on the nationaide TV show because I know its host is a long-time assassination-theory nut and because I'd had a bad experience with him during the Ricky White obscenity. They are aiming at nutty stuff on the King assassination. After long explanations I sent them some records. But that day I agreed to take the time for this small radio station on the assurance that no theorizing would be associated with it on airing. And whaddaya know! Michigan has been plagued by power surges. Among the damage was a fair amount to the station's equioment and the erasing of a number of tapes. So, I did the show again yesterday!

Now I have six new interruptions daily, soon, I hope to be reduced by half. Three times I have to ice the left foot and three times I have to soak it in warm water.

I'm not Job! I laughed when I wrote this, it is so hard to believe there can be so many interruptions, and I've not mentioned all of them.

And in a few minutes it will be going for the mail.

In any event, this explains why I have not written you about what I perceive in the

Middle East situation, particularly after reading the Lally Weymouth interview with Assad in Sunday's Post. I did highlight it to draw your attention to some of what he said. Oped in today's Post Weymouth says what I've long believed and interprets as I did what I highlighted in the interview.

In short he says there has been no change in Assad, that he is still the same revanchist s.o.b. and he can't see how Bush can see anything else or expect anything different from him.

Also in short, in the interview and in this oped piece it is not unreasonable to interpret what Assad still wants is the end to the State of Israel He certainly intends no concession of any kind, no agreement that does not return Israel to its pre-1967 borders and he will not agree to any face-to-face meeting. Which is apparent yet it is what Baker and Bush are basing all they are up to (in public) on.

As I've long been telling my rabbi friend of my youth, there is no prospect for any meaningful peace for Israel now under any circumstances and none that can be anticioated in what we can reasonable project into the future.

Perhaps for their own reasons Mubarek and King Hussein would agree to it, but no other Muslim ruler wants peace or will risk agreeing to it. If most did, even all agree to peace, and even if Arafat did, which I think he won't, there still would be no peace because there would be many of the PLO factions that will not and will continue the suspended terrorism-for which the Assads and Qaddafi's will continue to prepare them at the least - and nobody can control them.

This gets to why, much as I dislike Shamir (and before him Begin) I agree that Israel has to hold the so-called occupied territories. All of which are part of ancient Israel. Even the Golan because there was so much destruction waged from it. I am not certain it is the very same parcel of original Palestine Territory but if it isn't it is very close to a piece of land Britain gave Syria at the end of World War I. When its imperial ambitions and policies caused it to do what is now the basis of all the ills and evils in that troubled part of the world. Even, if I recall correctly, the plight of most of the Kurds. If then Britain had kept is word and established the expected and promised Jewish state when it created Trans-Jordan out of more than 70% of the Palestine Territory I believe that the state then would have been largely accepted and that the campaign against it would not have succeeded because it would not have had the support for it to succeed. Even Churchill was powerless then and later when among those in his own government who frustrated his policy was Anthony Eden. In some ways Ernie Bevin was even worse in the Labor government.

Britain turned the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem loose when he was in fact a war criminal and worked loudly on Hitler's behalf. He returned there and became one of the most virulent anti-Semitic Arab leaders, lending a religious cover to his Hitlerism and their's.

I have always believed that not as conspicuous but perhaps even more important to the

Arab heads of state is their fear of a successful shining oight of freedom and democracy for their abused masses to see and long for.

There is no really democractic Arab state and most are the most blood-thirsty dictatorships. The Israel issue is their major means of diverting their own downtrodden from their own plight, a kind of Roman Games. It is this for Bush also and he also requires diversions so our people will be diverted from what his and Reagan's policies have done to them and to their future. And yet will do.

Under Carter there was the Camp David accord. It in those years would have faced many problems but it could have been a beginning if he had not insisted then and later on trying to broaden it as Begin refused to accept and didn't. It is not lost on other Arab rulers that Sadat did not survive signing it.

Unilaterally Reagan rewrote it and nobody could do anything about it. Besides, no Arab state was going to recognize it anyway. But his broadening of it is the beginning of Bush's policy, Bush seeking to broaden it even more.

As Reagan had his Grenada when he was responsible for the catastrophe of the bombing of the Marines barracks in Lebanon, so also does Bush, after his initial adventure with Panama, need his Roman Games to divert attention from his magnifications of the Reaganite catastrophes, domestic and foreign. Including the frightful mess he made and continues in Iraq and innumerable disasters at home.

Aside from enriching the rich at the expense of the poor and the middle class, the Reagan and Bush policies are designed to make us more and more authoritarian. In this he finds the murderous Arab rulers kindred spirits.

When as it has been, the major media remains silent, even when he has his love fest with Assad while Assad is on the proscribed terrorist list, Bush and Baker know they will have major media support, which they have had, and thus popular support.

They can't not know that their scheme means more Israeli casualties and deaths in the near future and can mean the wiping out of Israel in the future. You may recall that from the time Reagan rewrote the Camp David agreement I've been saying that another holocaust is possible. It will become more likely if Israel loses control over any of the territory it controls that it has not incorporated into the State. The danger and suffering to its people from those territories would now be much greater becsuse the revanchists are better armed and better prepared to use their large variety of weapons. Without those parts of ancient Israel much of the present State of Israel would be only about nine miles wide. This would put it within artillery range, and I'm not talking about large weapons, either. Hand-held modern weapons could inflict major damages.

As Assad and his kind, know the above Shamir and most Israelis and Bush and Baker know.

That knowing it Bush and Baker persist says all that need be said about them.

It is like Bush running for election as a caring man and doing what causes more

suffering, as he knew it would and as he persists in even today in opposing such things as restoring what was taken from unemployment benfits; of being the education president by seeing to it that education will not be as good; of being the environmental president by resisting what he cannot frustrate of what can improve the environment that so badly needs improving.

In a sense he and his administration are like Reagan and his, two-dimensional and never concerned about what follows anything from which political (campaign and election) benefit can be anticipated.

Bush on his part is as uninhibited a liar as Reagan was. He learned his lesson well from Reagan and his successes with his dishonesties.

He says at any moment what at that moment promises votes and then forgets it and gets away with forgetting it. Ours has become a self-corrupting society and until there is a major disaster it will continue to be that.

Meanwhile, what most Americans know about the Middle East is what Bush and Baker say because it is rare when they hear or see anything else.

The major media want it this way and it will remain this way.

Bush and Baker have little opposition because those who do oppose their policies fear being hurt as a result. This includes the major Jewish organizations, and their leaders. And Democrats.

There is no basis for even hoping for any signifiant change in the Bush/Baker policies amd no basis for even suspecting that any Arab state will agree to peace with Israel that can be a meaningful peace if they'll all agree to any kind, which I doubt.

There isn't much Israel can do because it depends on major assistance from the United States, even more now with the major influx of Jewish refugees and the enormous costs that entails.

Assad timed the interview to appear at summit time, when he knew the invitation would be made. In it he spelled it out to all Arabs, all Arab leaders included: no chnage of any kind. Except for a graf I marked in yesterday's Post, where an unnamed US official approved Assad's statements, until Weymouth today I've seen no comment. I think he also designed his statements to require Shamir's rejection of the conference because he stated his terms and Shamir cannot accept them. We'll know what Israel replies soon. Meanwhile, there will be no peace because the Arabs do not want peace, won't change except possibly in appearance and because Bush/Baker also don't want peace there. Instead they are buying the Arabs and preparing more Roman Games. It is crude, it is cruel-Hitlerian in purpose -and they know what they are doing. There is no ground for real hope for peace there and American Jews like my dear friend the rabbi and the Israeli peaceniks are converting their own good intentions and hopes into reality, a reality that now cannot be.

Best,

Harold